

Appl. No. 09/991,324  
Response dated 01/18/2007  
Reply to Office Action of 07/18/2006

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

#### **Remarks**

Claims 90, 98, 103 and new claims 106 and 107 are pending in this Application. Claims 1-89, 91-97, 99, 101-102 and 104-105 were previously canceled by Applicant. Claim 100 is canceled by Applicant by this amendment. Claims 90, 98 and 103 have been amended in response to the Office Action of July 18, 2006 and new dependent claims 106 and 107 are added in this amendment to further clarify the invention.

#### **Rejections of Claims 90 and 103 under 35 USC §102**

The Examiner rejected claims 90 and 103 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,847,604 to Doyle ("Doyle"). Doyle is directed generally to a method and apparatus for identifying predefined features of an image on a user's video display however, Doyle does not contemplate and is not configured to provide data over a multiple user environment. With respect to amended claim 90, Doyle does not teach or suggest "obtaining data associated with said at least one result object from said at least one first computer in response to said request, said data represents said identifying information provided by said providing user for said at least one result object" as presently claimed in claim 90.

With respect to claim 103, Doyle does not teach or suggest the claimed "means for associating a hyperlink with said at least one result image data to initiate a request for other image data" as presently claimed in claim 103. Thus, Doyle does not anticipate claims 90 or 103. The amendment to claim 103 is not new matter because support is found in at least

Appl. No. 09/991,324  
Response dated 01/18/2007  
Reply to Office Action of 07/18/2006

paragraph 58 of the disclosure and in original claim 21. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully urged.

#### **Rejections of Claims 98 and 100 under 35 USC §103**

The Examiner rejected claims 98 and 100 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Doyle in view of Kuchinsky et al. ("Fotofile: A Consumer Multimedia Organization and Retrieval System"). The Examiner's rejection with respect to claim 100 is moot as claim 100 has been canceled by this amendment.

Doyle was briefly described above in connection with claims 90 and 103. Kuchinsky et al. describes the Fotofile system where a user can organize and retrieve digital images and use face detection and recognition for images. With respect to claim 98, neither Doyle nor Kuchinsky et al. disclose, either alone or in combination, "presenting said at least one result image data to said searching user that initiated said request and presenting said identifying information at said coordinates of said at least one person, said identifying information includes one or more identifying pages presented to said searching user" as presently claimed in claim 98. The amendment to claim 98 (underlined portion) is not new matter because support is found in at least paragraphs 57 and 58 of the disclosure. Thus, claim 98 is allowable over the art cited by the Examiner. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 98 is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 09/991,324  
Response dated 01/18/2007  
Reply to Office Action of 07/18/2006

**New Dependent Claims 106 and 107**

New dependent claim 106 depends from claim 90 and further recites wherein said at least one result object has an associated hyperlink adapted to initiate a request for other image data comprising said at least one result object. Claim 106 is not shown or described by the art of record and is also allowable and does not constitute new matter for the reasons explained above for claim 90.

New dependent claim 107 depends from claim 98 and further recites wherein said at least one result image data presented to said searching user has an associated hyperlink adapted for initiating a request for other image data. Claim 107 is not shown or described by the art of record and is allowable for this reason and for the reasons explained above for claim 98. Claim 107 does not constitute new matter for at least the reasons explained above for claim 90.

Appl. No. 09/991,324  
Response dated 01/18/2007  
Reply to Office Action of 07/18/2006


### CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated herein, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 90, 98, 103, 106 and 107 are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner differs in this conclusion, the Examiner is hereby requested to contact Applicant's representative for purposes of a telephone interview at the number listed below before any action (other than an allowance) is initiated.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward C. Schewe, Reg. No.: 34,246  
Tel. (626) 405-1413

Correspondence Info:	<b>CERTIFICATE OF MAILING or TRANSMISSION</b>
Customer Number <b>36067</b>	<i>I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on <u>January 18, 2007</u> to 571-273-8300 or is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.</i>
	 <i>1-18-2007</i>
	Signature _____ Date: <i>January 18, 2007</i>
	Name: Edward C. Schewe